

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are pending in the application. In the final Office Action of December 15, 2006, the Examiner made the following disposition:

- A.) Objected to claim 4.
- B.) Rejected claims 1, 2, and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Killebrew, et al.* in view of *Kojima*.
- C.) Rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Killebrew, et al.* in view of *Kojima* and further in view of *Snyder*.
- D.) Rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Killebrew, et al.* in view of in view of *Kojima* and further in view of *Hasenauer*.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and addresses the Examiner's disposition below. Claims 1, 3, and 4 have been amended.

A.) Objection to claim 4:

Claim 4 has been amended as per the Examiner's request to overcome the objection.

Applicants respectfully submit the objection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

B.) Rejection of claims 1, 2, and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Killebrew, et al.* in view of *Kojima*:

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Independent claim 1, as amended, claims a battery pack housing a plurality of battery cells. The battery pack comprises a case having a conductive terminal board respectively connecting positive electrodes and negative electrodes of the plurality of battery cells to outside terminals. The conductive terminal board has a structure in which a first member is joined with a second member such that the first member having excellent weldability is arrayed in a plurality-of-islands state in the second member having excellent conductivity. The first member of the conductive terminal board includes a rectangular slit in at least one island portion of the first member. (*See, e.g.*, slits in islands of first member 11 in Figures 2 and 3). As discussed in Applicant's specification, the first terminal board being arrayed in a plurality-of-islands state in the second terminal board allows the conductive terminal board to thinner than conventional conductive terminal boards. (Specification page 6, lines 17-24).

Referring to Figure 3c as an illustrative example, the second member 12 has a structure in which a projecting portion 12b for connecting a control circuit substrate is provided on one short side of a plate portion 12a having an oblong card shape that is larger than the first member 11 in outer shape thereof. The first member 11 is joined with the plate portion 12a of the second member 12. The combined thickness of the first member 11 joined with the second member 12 is approximately uniform. (*See, e.g.*, specification page 12, lines 13-25).

This is unlike *Killebrew* in view of *Kojima*, which fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed second member. As shown in *Killebrew* Figure 1B, *Killebrew's* second members 106A and 106B do not have a projecting portion, which connects to a control circuit substrate, provided on a short side of a card shaped plate portion. To begin with *Killebrew's* second members 106A and 106B do not include a card shaped plate portion. Further, *Killebrew's* projections are not provided on a short side of a card shaped plate portion. Further, a combined thickness of *Killebrew's* first members 108A and 108B joined with its second members 106A and 106B is not approximately uniform. Thus, *Killebrew* fails to disclose or suggest claim 1 for at least these reasons.

Referring to *Kojima's* Figures 1-3, *Kojima* also fails to disclose or suggest a second member that has a projecting portion, which connects to a control circuit substrate, provided on a short side of a card shaped plate portion. As shown in *Kojima's* Figure, *Kojima* fails to disclose or suggest a second member that includes a card shaped plate portion. Further, *Kojima* fails to teach or suggest projections that are not provided on a short side of a card shaped plate portion. Further, a combined thickness of *Killebrew's* first members joined with its second members is not approximately uniform.

Thus, *Killebrew* in view of *Kojima* still fails to disclose or suggest claim 1 for at least these reasons.

Claims 2-4 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

C.) Rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Killebrew, et al.* in view of *Kojima* and further in view of *Snyder*:

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Applicant's claim 1 is allowable over *Killebrew* in view of *Kojima* as discussed above. *Snyder* still fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed second member. Therefore, *Killebrew* in view of *Kojima* and further in view of *Snyder* still fails to disclose or suggest claim 1.

Claim 3 depends directly or indirectly from claim 1 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

D.) Rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Killebrew, et al.* in view of in view of *Kojima* and further in view of *Hasenauer*:

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Applicant's claim 1 is allowable over *Killebrew* in view of *Kojima* as discussed above. *Hasenauer* still fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed second member. Therefore, *Killebrew* in view of *Kojima* and further in view of *Hasenauer* still fails to disclose or suggest claim 1.

Claim 3 depends directly or indirectly from claim 1 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-4 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher P. Rauch/ (Reg. No. 45,034)
Christopher P. Rauch
SONNENSCHNEIDER, NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box #061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Telephone 312/876-2606
Customer #26263
Attorneys for Applicant(s)